Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheet or sheets of drawings includes changes to Fig. identify amended figure number and replaces the original sheet including Fig. identify all figure numbers on the sheet.

In Figure identify amended figure number, describe amendment to figure.

Attachments following last page of this Amendment:

Replacement Sheet (number of sheets pages)
Annotated Sheet Showing Change(s) (number of sheets pages)

REMARKS

The specification has been amended to correct an obvious error, given the ratios and other features recited in the original claims.

The pending claims 28, 30-32, 34, 38 and 43-46 have been amended to correct informalities identified by the Examiner.

Claim 24 has been amended to include a limitation of original 27, to distinguish 'hook' elements that are but straight filaments with deformed distal ends.

Claims 1-23 have been voluntarily canceled, and are therefore not addressed in this response. Applicants submit that the rejections of claims 1-23 are rendered moot.

Claims 24-34, 36, 40-46 and 48 have been rejected as anticipated by Higachinaka, U.S. 5,515,583. Applicants submit that Higachinaka does not anticipate any of the claims as filed, in that Higachinaka does not fairly disclose or suggest all of the features of any claim.

Claim 24 recites that "the hook filaments extend from a near side of the fabric base to a mean hook height of less than about 6.0 times a nominal diameter of the hook filaments." Claim 40 recites that "the fabric base has an overall thickness, exclusive of the hook filaments, that is less than the nominal hook filament diameter."

Regarding hook heights and filament diameters, Higachinaka includes the following: "The height of hook-like fastening elements 3 ... is 1.3 to 3.8 mm" (6:8-10). "Where a synthetic monofilament is used for preparing hook-like fastening elements, the monofilament generally has a diameter of 0.1 to 0.4 mm, preferably 0.14 to 0.25 mm." (6:57-59). The disclosure of these preferred ranges is accompanied by discussion of why hook heights and filament diameters outside of those ranges are undesirable. Regarding fabric base thickness, Higachinaka states that: "The base fabric comprising a woven or knit fabric generally has a thickness of 0.3 to 3.0 mm." (5:21-22). Beginning at column 11, line 16, Higachinaka lists several "experimental examples" with listed dimensions. While not conceding that any of the dimensions quoted above from Higachinaka correspond to the variables featured in the pending claims, Applicants contend that, even if they did so correspond, Higachinaka does not disclose any embodiments meeting the

ratio limitations of claims 24 or 40.

With respect to the preferred ranges disclosed in columns 5-7 of Higachinaka, Applicants respectfully submit that finding this disclosure to anticipate claim 24 or claim 40 would be contrary to established principles of patent law, as it is generally held that the disclosure in one document of ranges of multiple variables is not itself a disclosure of every combination of possible values in each range, unless someone of ordinary skill would find such combinations to be necessarily disclosed, with sufficient specificity. With respect to claim 24 it would be improper to take the ratio of the lower end of hook height (1.3 mm), and divide that value by the upper end of hook filament diameter (0.4 mm) to derive a hook filament diameter to hook height ratio of 3.25. Columns 5-7 of Higachinaka could not be taken to support a claim featuring a hook filament diameter to hook height ratio of less than 6.0, and it can not be said to defeat the novelty of such a claim. Simply put, there is nothing in Higachinaka that would suggest that every value of one disclosed range is useful or even functional in combination with every value of every other range. Indeed, there is nothing in Higachinaka to suggest to one of skill in this art that a hook of such stout dimensions would be either practical or useful. Rather, one of skill in the art may well presume from the disclosure that values toward the higher end of the hook monofilament diameter range would be considered only in combination with values from the higher end of the disclosed range for hook height.

Similarly, it would be improper and a *non sequitur* to compare the lower limit on the preferred range of base thickness (0.3) to the upper range of hook filament diameter (0.4) and conclude that Higachinaka discloses a hook product with a base thickness less than the hook filament diameter. Thus, the disclosed ranges of columns 5-7 of Higachinaka also do not defeat the novelty of claim 40.

Therefore, although columns 5-7 of Higachinaka do include broad ranges of various values from which, assuming direct correspondence to the variables featured in Applicants' claims, values could be pulled to derive ratios within the claimed ranges, Higachinaka does not meet the requirements of an anticipatory or novelty-destroying reference.

The only clear disclosure in Higachinaka of combinations of hook filament diameters and

hook heights is with respect to "experimental examples" 1-11. If one were to assume that the ratio featured in claim 24 corresponds particularly to values disclosed in these examples, the following ratios might be calculated:

Example	Hook diameter	Hook height	Hook height/dia ratio
1-4	0.2	1.3	6.5
5-8	0.17	1.9	11.2
9	0.21	1.5	7.1
10	0.34	2.0	5.9
11	0.34	1.8	5.3

From such an analysis, one might be tempted to improperly conclude that at least the hooks of examples 10 and 11 of Higachinaka are within the scope of Applicants' claim 24. However, in examples 10 and 11 of Higachinaka, the 'hook-like fastening elements' are headed stems (see Higachinaka, 12:65-13:3), not hooks formed by a severed hook filament loop, as required by amended claim 24. The problem addressed by Applicants by the claimed feature combination is inapplicable to such straight filament projections with 'swollen heads.'

With respect to claim 40, none of the specific examples 1-11 described in Higachinaka disclose a specific base thickness. The Examiner has pointed to column 5, lines 22-23 of Higachinaka as disclosing a base thickness of 0.3 to 3.0 mm, but there is nothing in the reference that links any specific thickness, within that range or otherwise, with the specific hook heights disclosed in the examples the Examiner cites from column 11. It requires the same improper reach to try to match a base thickness from column 5 with the specific yarn filament diameters from columns 11 and 12, and there is insufficient information in the abstract to calculate any overall thickness.

In short, the Examiner is respectfully reminded that the mere presence within a single document of every element found within a claim does not necessarily provide an anticipation of that claim. Rather, there must be an *example*, within the document, that is anticipatory. An anticipating example need not be identified as an example per se, as in columns 11 and 12 of

Higachinaka, but the document as a whole must make it clear to someone of ordinary skill in this art that a specific, anticipating example is disclosed.

Claims 3, 5 and 8 have been rejected as obvious over Higachinaka. As such claims have been voluntarily canceled, this rejection is taken to be moot.

Claims 35, 37, 38 and 47 have been rejected as obvious over Higachinaka in view of Shepard et al. (US 2002/0029441, "Shepard"). Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is based upon an improper characterization of Higachinaka, as discussed above with respect to the novelty rejection, and further traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

Shepard discloses a non-woven loop material made from staple (i.e., short) fibers and having a particularly low basis weight. Shepard also discloses that this non-woven loop material can have a particularly low stiffness. But there is nothing in either reference or their proposed combination that would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art that the short, tenacious fibers used by Shepard could somehow be woven into a base to create an improved version of Higachinaka's woven loop product, or provides even the slightest hint at how to reduce the stiffness of a woven loop product.

Claims 39 and 49 have been rejected as obvious over Higachinaka in view of Goulait (US 5,326,612). Again, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is based upon an improper characterization of Higachinaka, as discussed above with respect to the novelty rejection, and further traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

As with Shepard (who also discloses a very low basis weight), Goulait discloses a *non-woven* loop fastener material, not, as the Examiner contends, a woven loop material. The Examiner is undoubtedly familiar with the methods of producing woven and non-woven loop materials, and therefore aware that the fact that a non-woven loop material can be fashioned of such low basis weight does not give any suggestion how to do so in a weaving process. Furthermore, it is the combination of low basis weight with the features of the base claims that is

being specifically claimed as non-obvious by Applicants, not the mere presence of low basis weight in a woven fastener product, and a prima facie case of obviousness must include at least a reasonable explanation of why someone of ordinary skill would be motivated, by an enabling prior art disclosure, to produce the claimed invention.

No fees are believed due. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing the above attorney docket number.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 26, 2005

James W. Babineau
Reg. No. 42,276

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21173933.doc